

Report on expulsions called incomplete

by Mary Beth Donahue

An inquiry by the sub-committee of the student welfare committee into the events and reasons for the expulsions of two students was called

Flatt convicted, Galloway's case dismissed

Charges, in connection with an anti-CIA protest, against Stephen Galloway were dismissed last Monday, Nov. 4 in Fredericksburg General District Court. Kevin Flatt was convicted on four charges.

Flatt was convicted of assault and battery, destroying public and personal property and breach of peace in the alleged throwing of a bag of pig's blood on a table, splattering a recruiter for the CIA. Flatt was fined \$100 and sentenced to 10 days in jail suspended on condition of good behavior for a year. A charge of profanity in public was dropped.

According to The Free Lance-Star, the case was dropped against Galloway apparently because court summonses to three eyewitnesses were never delivered.

The case against Galloway was dismissed after Commonwealth Atty. H. Harrison Braxton Jr. told the court that "evidence by witnesses present in court do not sustain any charge" against Galloway, according to The Free Lance-Star.

Summonses to John D. Crozman, CIA recruiter, and two other witnesses—recruiters Thomas J. Nash of Reynolds Metals and Barnard W. Grier of Aetna Life Insurance—supposedly were mailed by the court on Oct. 29

incomplete when presented to the student senate and a follow up investigation is underway.

Because Kevin Flatt, Steve Galloway and their attorney were not consulted in the investigation, letters with questions involving the hearing have been mailed to them.

The sub-committee was investigating the expulsions arising from the blood throwing incident of October 17. The sub-committee recommended that the senate clearly define the legal limits of peaceful and violent protest and determine what conduct or general attitude is considered unsatisfactory.

The college catalogue on page 23 states, "The college administration reserves the right to request any student to withdraw whose conduct or general attitude is considered unsatisfactory, even though no specific charge is made."

The report states, "We must demand dissent in our differences as a community. The college community must see change as possible, that dissenters will be heard rather than risk the disillusionment that a campus of fear would create."

The committee also recommended that an orderly procedure, allowing for administrative hearings whereby the rights of the students can be safeguarded by the student government, be set up and all channels of communication be open for dissent.

The report states, "We fear a dangerous precedent may have been set by the administration in reference to page 23 of the catalogue."

According to the committee report, it is believed that the actions of the administrative hearing were not because of personal political views, or vengeance, but rather in pursuit of maintaining a respectful college identity.

The committee expressed their indebtedness to the President, Vice-President and the arresting officer, Daniel Bishop, for their willingness to discuss fully and freely the events of the incident.

The reasons given by Woodward and Merchant for the expulsions were public embarrassment to the college, disrespect to an invited guest, destruction of private property belonging to the CIA

representative (clothes) and disruption of a college function.

According to the committee's report, the two students offered no defense or explanation of their actions during the hearing, although given ample time to do so. The two students did not ask for separate hearings in consideration of Galloway's previous conviction by the Student Judicial court for a residence violation which resulted in him being placed on Social Probation.

Administrative hearings are a legal right of the college of Virginia. Woodward acted in accordance to his power of authority as stated on p. 23 in the college catalogue, according to the report.

Flatt and Galloway were advised by their counsel to make no comment during the hearing. The reason for their attorney advising them not to issue a statement was unclear.

According to the committee's report, although it was felt that further legal action by him was anticipated on their behalf. The letters sent to Galloway, Flatt and their attorney are meant to answer these questions.

The question of Bishop as arresting officer and Jere Willis as Commonwealth Attorney was examined in relation to the students' inability to defend themselves in fear of double jeopardy. Bishop was called to testify by Woodward not in relation to the incident occurring on Mary Washington College property.

According to the report, Bishop was not asked by Flatt, Galloway, or their attorney, to leave the room in order for the two students to make a further explanation of their actions. Willis was present in the room in his capacity as attorney of Mary Washington College, on the request of Woodward.

Rabson writes to Woodward

(Editor's note: This letter was sent to the Bullet by Dr. Rabson after she had sent the original to Mr. Woodward).

Dear President Woodward:

This letter is to express my shock and disappointment at the manner in which the hearing was carried out where the two male students involved in the blood throwing incident were expelled from Mary Washington College. The rapidity and the secrecy used in carrying out their sentences is reminiscent of the Star Chamber procedures used in England in the seventeenth century. I believe that